

Application No. 10/062,484
Amendment filed on May 23, 2006
After Final Office Action of February 23, 2006

Docket No.: 0941-0401P

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 remain present in this application.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Entry of Amendments

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendments simply clarify the claims, and do not raise new issues or include new matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered.

Rejection under 35 USC 112

Claims 1 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1 and 9 are indefinite because it is unclear how "a new sign-on information is related to successfully signs on to the application program after signing on to the application program server".

As is discussed on page 5, lines 24-19, a single sign-on module 110 is utilized to send the sign-on information back to the SSO 200 for updating when the application program module 110 successfully signs on to the AP 300 (see also Fig. 2). Moreover, as discussed on page 7, lines 20-25, in step 380 of Fig. 3, the client computer 100 sends the sign-on information with the accepted sign-on password back to the SSO 200 for encryption and updating (step S380), so that the sign-on information may be up-to-date for the next single sign-on procedure.

Application No. 10/062,484
Amendment filed on May 23, 2006
After Final Office Action of February 23, 2006

Docket No.: 0941-0401P

Although the previously presented claims should be clear, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to emphasize that the new sign-on information is sent "after successfully signing on to the application program server." Accordingly, all claims should particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the instant invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Bones et al., U.S. Publication 2002/0078386, in view of Fang et al., U.S. Patent 6,240,512. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The patent to Bones discloses a method and a system for changing a plurality of target passwords in a single sign-on environment, but fails to explicitly disclose sending new sign-on information after successfully signing on to the application program server.

The patent to Fang discloses a method and apparatus for implementing a single sign-on mechanism that coordinates logons in a distributed computer network. It also discloses that the single sign-on framework within a PKM application programming interface allows the user to create a new target, update to a target's data, query a target's information, and delete an existing target (see column 5, lines 43-56). However, referring to the definition of the target, each application, server, or system to which a user needs an ID/password pair to logon is defined as a "target" (see column 5, lines 45-47). The target of Fang is not the same as the sign-on information of the present application, so the sign-on information will not update after signing on to the application program successfully. In the present invention, however, the user utilizes pre-

Application No. 10/062,484
Amendment filed on May 23, 2006
After Final Office Action of February 23, 2006

Docket No.: 0941-0401P

saved sign-on information in a single sign-on process to sign on to the application programs automatically. Further, the sign-on information is updated after signing on to the application programs successfully, so that the sign-on information is kept up-to-date. Fang et al. fails to teach or suggest the step of "sending a new sign-on information after successfully signing on to the application program server," as is found in independent claim 1 of the present application.

With regard to independent claim 9, this claim also sets forth, "updating the sign-on information saved in the single sign-on server by sending a new sign-on information to the single sign-on server after successfully signing on to the application program server," and is therefore neither taught nor suggested by the prior art utilized by the Examiner, for similar reasons to those set forth above in connection with independent claim 1.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the prior art utilized by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the system or method of independent claims 1 and 9, as well as their dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 10/062,484
Amendment filed on May 23, 2006
After Final Office Action of February 23, 2006


Docket No.: 0941-0401P

In the event the Examiner does not consider this application to be in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purposes of Appeal. This Amendment does not raise new issues or contain new matter, and should overcome the current grounds of rejection and therefore simplify the issues for Appeal. Nonetheless, it should be unnecessary to proceed to Appeal because the instant application should now be in condition for allowance.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joe McKinney Murphy
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant